



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/430,350	10/29/1999	MASSIMO SUTERA	P4158/PJM	7163

32291 7590 01/10/2003

MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP  
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE  
SUITE 170  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

JONES, HUGH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/430,350

Applicant(s)  
Sutera et al.

Examiner  
Hugh Jones

Art Unit  
2123



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hugh Jones

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Ken Wright

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Nov 27, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:  
all, ingeneral

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants did not provide an agenda as requested. Applicants indicated that they did not understand the 103 combinations. The Examiner maintained that the 103 rejections were clearly written and noted that the Examiner responded to this issue earlier (paper # 8, paragraph 35) in response to paper # 7. Applicants complained at the number of rejections. The Examiner indicated that the claims were broad and disclosed in numerous prior art teachings.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is  
an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required